## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

OREN FRANKS, Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:24-cv-00724-JAD-NJK

v.

Order [Docket No. 23]

LENS.COM, INC.,

Defendant.

Pending before the Court is Defendant's motion to stay discovery pending resolution of motions to transfer other cases to the District of Nevada. Docket No. 23. Plaintiff submitted a notice of non-opposition. Docket No. 24. The motion is properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

The Court has broad discretionary power to control discovery. *See, e.g., Little v. City of Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988). The party seeking a stay of discovery bears the heavy burden of making a strong showing that discovery should be denied. *Turner Broad. Sys., Inc. v. Tracinda Corp.*, 175 F.R.D. 554, 556 (D. Nev. 1997). Discovery may be stayed when: (1) there is a pending motion that is potentially dispositive in scope and effect; (2) the potentially dispositive motion can be decided without additional discovery; and (3) the Court has taken a "preliminary peek" at the merits of the underlying motion and is convinced that Plaintiff will be unable to state a claim for relief. *Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013).

Defendant's motion fails to meet, let alone mention, the standards for a stay of discovery. See Flynn v. Nevada, 345 F.R.D. 338 (D. Nev. 2024). Instead, Defendant requests that the Court grant a stay of proceedings, and analyzes the request under the Landis factors, which are used to determine whether a court should stay a case. Docket No. 23 at 5-11; see also Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248 (1936). Given the failure to provide meaningfully developed argument or the appropriate legal framework, the Court declines to address the dispute presented.

Accordingly, the motion to stay discovery is **DENIED**. Docket No. 23. A joint discovery plan must be filed by October 17, 2024. See Local Rule 26-1. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: October 10, 2024 Nancy J. Koppe United States Magistrate Judge